

June 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12949

As used in this subtitle, the term "food product" means flour, excluding flour clearly not used for human consumption as determined by the Secretary, semolina, farina, bulgur, beverage and any other product composed wholly or partly of wheat which the Secretary may determine to be a food product.

I see no reason for the disruption and unemployment in Illinois and other States which would follow the subsidy proposal in H.R. 8629. It would not increase the consumption of agricultural products at all, since we merely would be substituting one agricultural product for other agricultural products.

To repeat, the central issue is whether the Government will subsidize wheat to replace corn and grain sorghums in industrial products. Mr. Speaker, I think the answer should be a loud and resounding "No."

MORALITY IN PUBLIC SERVICE

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama (at the request of Mr. GROVER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, too often we in this country accept as uncontested fact that our system of government will automatically prevail over everything and will not be seriously challenged, at least from within.

It is well that we be reminded that self-government has failed on other occasions, and might still be considered as experimental from the standpoint of history.

In this connection I call attention to the following portion of an article by Mr. N. S. Meese appearing in the New Age magazine for June 1965:

Benjamin Franklin's long life, wide experience, and extensive study had convinced him that republics had a history of enjoying only short lives. It was doubtless this that prompted him to answer an inquiry following the Philadelphia Convention as to what kind of government was in store for the country by saying, "We have given you a republic—if you can keep it." He knew only too well that under the new Constitution the people gave to those they elected to govern them dangerous power, and he, with Washington and others, had misgivings.

Now, two centuries later, those who have the most to lose seem to have become the least vigilant in guarding the fundamental freedoms for which over the years thousands have died ingloriously to gain. They are threatened now to an even greater degree than when Senator Borah warned of the danger to them by attrition. They can never be kept safe by being inscribed on a sheet of parchment preserved in our archives. They can be preserved only when they are held deep in the hearts of men and women who are aware of their cost in blood and treasure and who know what their loss would mean.

The Great Charter of our liberties as signed in the summer of 1787 and amended subsequently in accordance with the provisions contained in it is a valid contract between the people of this Nation and their Government. Being such it is the duty of both parties to that contract to see that it is fully and faithfully observed in both letter and spirit rather than interpreted in a manner dictated by the whims of men.

The greatest need in this country today is for a resurgence of morality in public serv-

ice—a new and honest respect for the spirit and meaning of the Constitution of the United States and a firm resolve by those who have sworn to protect and defend it to abide by that oath. They would do well to remember Gen. Robert E. Lee's observation that "Duty is the sublimest word in our language. You cannot do more; you should never wish to do less."—N. S. Meese.

CIA OPERATIONS REMAIN SECRET

(Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the following article, from the Washington Post of June 3, to the House for consideration. The article was written by Mr. Harry Ferguson and concerns the Central Intelligence Agency.

It is often distressing to me to hear severe criticism of the CIA by citizens—including Members of Congress—who have only limited knowledge of its functions and activities. How many times have we heard indignant protests about the CIA being an all too powerful, fourth branch of the U.S. Government? A recent publication, "The Invisible Government," pictures the CIA as some sort of power-hungry, aggressive, and irresponsible organization. For some strange reason, the CIA's most vocal critics seem to attack the nature of its secrecy. I wonder if these critics can imagine how effective an intelligence apparatus could be were it required to respond to every ounce of criticism and skepticism. I daresay were that the case, we might as well close up shop.

Mr. Speaker, I am not among those Members privy to appraisal of the CIA's scope. I do know, however—as we all should know—that a congressional committee does exist to insure that the CIA does not exceed its bounds. I can appreciate, therefore, that there are those among us who are privy to such information and who have a great knowledge of the activities of this organization; and I might add that I have not heard protest from any of these Members about the CIA being irresponsible or power hungry or anything.

Mr. Speaker, from what I know of the CIA, I can honestly say that I heartily approve; and of what I do not know, I can hastily add that it is quit obviously none of my business. I am grateful and proud that we have men and women in our country who are willing to make sacrifices to provide us with information we desperately need for our own defense and the defense of all freemen. I am likewise grateful that the CIA stands above its critics and therefore protects the very secrets it needs to survive and to render effective service to our country.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 3, 1965]
CIA'S OPERATIONS REMAIN A SECRET TO ALL BUT A FEW

(By Harry Ferguson)

A story is going around that one day a top official of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) needed some information on the manager of a factory in the Soviet Union. He called for the files and, somewhat to his

surprise, found all possible information about the man, including the fact that his mistress had dyed her hair three times. Different color every time.

It could be true, for the CIA has information about Russia that would shock Moscow. Each month the CIA buys or otherwise obtains 200,000 pieces of literature from Russia, the European Communist bloc, and Red China. It has a translating computer that turns Russian into English at the rate of 30,000 words an hour. Nothing from Russia is too small to interest the CIA—railroad timetables, the pig population in the Ukraine, what movie is being shown in Kiev.

The CIA operates in a highly unorthodox fashion. It lists its number in the telephone book and everybody knows that its headquarters are at Langley, Va. But the CIA has plenty of secrets and keeps them well.

BUDGET KEPT SECRET

There are perhaps a dozen men in Washington who know how much the CIA spends annually, but the best guesses are between \$400 million and \$1 billion. No where in the Federal budget will you find any money allotted to the CIA.

Each year the CIA Director appears before small panels made up of senior members of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees. He tells them how much money he needs, but doesn't have to explain how he is going to spend it. After the Congressmen OK the expenditure, the money is broken up into small items and salted and hidden throughout the Federal budget. An item for 1,000 monkey wrenches in the Air Force budget could well be CIA money.

People who work for the CIA are divided into "overts" and "illegals." The overts work in open, keep regular office hours and the only restraint they are under is that they are forbidden to discuss the type of work they do. The illegals fan out across the world and operate in the full knowledge that if they are caught, they may forfeit their lives. One of the big battlegrounds of espionage is Berlin, and the West German Government estimates there are 12,000 Soviet intelligence agents there. Nobody has any precise figures on the CIA strength in Berlin, but it can be assumed the situation is well covered.

BECOMES A NEW MAN

The first thing that happens to a man when he becomes a CIA illegal is that he loses his identity. He gets a new name, a new birthplace, and a new family. If he is going to operate in Italy, he not only must learn to speak flawless Italian, but in the precise accent of the province where he will be working.

Then he is papered. He is equipped with every sort of document he could conceivably need in his new environment and he is taught how to manufacture new ones if the need arises.

The next thing is to arrange a drop, a place where the agent can leave information and be sure it will wind up in Langley, Va.

The CIA's enemies see it as a sort of anonymous branch of the U.S. Government that is going around meddling in the internal affairs of both friendly and unfriendly nations. It is accused of helping make a complete botch of the Bay of Pigs invasion in Cuba and the events leading up to the present crisis in South Vietnam. Some persons even profess to see a threat to our own Government from an organization maintaining a sort of private army and operating in secrecy.

Allen Dulles, former CIA Director, denied all this in a recent television interview. He said the CIA never had jumped into a situation without getting the consent of the President. He also defended the necessity for secrecy by pointing out that Russia and Red China were pushing their espionage battles strongly and that you had to fight fire with fire.

(Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. WELTNER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the House the following article from the Washington Daily News of September 8. The article is written by Richard Starnes and is entitled, "Clip the CIA's Wings."

In the last paragraph of his article, Mr. Starnes describes anti-CIA expression as "CIA baiting." He contends this type of expression is legitimate—indeed is called for—and offers his own article as a justified expression of criticism about our chief intelligence agency. I submit that warranted criticism is often advisably recorded; but, I further contend that Mr. Starnes' criticism is perhaps unwarranted. In fact, I believe him to be guilty of the very thing he scorns—CIA baiting.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I applauded the efforts of the CIA. My remarks were directed to the House Members and are in the Record. At that time, I saluted the role of the CIA in aiding our national defense, and the dedication and ability of its employees in doing the same. These feelings obviously need to be restated.

Mr. Speaker, the CIA is a welcome target for all critics. To real and potential critics, it represents a snake without venom; it is defenseless and subject to wide varieties of abuse. Might I say though, that it is defenseless only because it chooses to be defenseless. I am certain, were the CIA to list its record of accomplishment, we would all be overwhelmed at the successes this relatively young Agency has enjoyed. I am sure we would be even more overwhelmed were we to compare such a record of accomplishment with the number of well-known and publicized failures. I think we would find an Agency with a very definite and positive posture of excellence.

The past failures of the CIA are major only in the sense that they are sensationally publicized. For the most part, the CIA is an unknown, and to discover something about an unknown is sensational. Since the Agency does not make it a practice to advertise success, the pub-

lic must be content with hearing of failure. Ask any citizen what he knows of CIA activity and he will tell you something about the Bay of Pigs, the U-2, or the recent Singapore exposure. Can he tell you what unfriendly governments the CIA has penetrated? Can he tell you anything about the successful U-2 flights, and the tremendous possibility these flights had for providing us with valuable intelligence information?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot resist comparing the CIA to any American airline. Every day, our airlines serve the public with safe and comfortable flights. This has become so common as to become unrecognized. Upon occasion, however, a plane disaster occurs and the front page of every newspaper is alive with details of the tragedy. This is news. Who wants to read about every normal, safe, and pleasant flight? The CIA finds itself in the same position. A blunder is magnified beyond proportion and the public is left with a bad taste.

continue to hear, demands for a joint congressional committee to oversee the responsibility of the CIA. Apparently it is not enough that four congressional committees are already privy to much CIA information. No, the demand is made for a "master committee," one to get into specific projects and to investigate unsuccessful and embarrassing ploys. I cannot believe these demands are well thought out. I cannot believe those calling for such a committee have truly deduced the repercussions such an arrangement could have. To have the CIA directly responsible to a congressional committee for specific projects is to destroy the veil of secrecy which necessarily surrounds such projects. To advise additional Members of Congress of the Agency's innermost workings is to jeopardize the possible success of any particular project. I do not say that Members of Congress would consciously, though innocently, reveal any information of a secure nature, but confidential information becomes less so every time someone else learns of it.

The charges leveled against the CIA are all too familiar. They are collectively assembled under the catchall, irresponsibility. CIA is allegedly irresponsible when it errs, when a failure becomes known, and every time the desired result is not perfectly successful—in which case we would never specifically hear of it. Well, I do not think the CIA is irresponsible. Businessmen have learned that the virtue of courage and taking a chance is essential to success. The profit motive is the inspiration here. With the CIA, the profit motive is the maintenance of our national security and the freedom of all liberty-loving people. This, to me, is a much more meaningful and essential end. In this sense, I salute the CIA for its determination and courage, and especially for its refusal to succumb to answering the pointless charges of ill-informed critics.

The Daily News article follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 8, 1965]

CLIP THE CIA'S WINGS (By Richard Starnes)

The vast, bumbling bureaucracy of the Central Intelligence Agency has lately been revealed as the profligate disbursing agent of millions of unaccountable U.S. dollars.

There can be no surprise in this: CIA responds to no checkrein, and is blessed with the same sort of lavish appropriations that make it such a pleasure to run up a budget for the FBI. The important difference, of course, is that the FBI must account for the huge sums Congress presses upon it, right down to the final box of paper clips, but the CIA operates under no such fretful inhibition.

The spooks simply wait upon an informal gathering of top-ranking members of House and Senate Appropriation Committees, explain their anticipated needs, and get the money. No CIA appropriation as such ever goes through the Congress, since the total (which approaches \$1 billion) is said to be secret. Instead the sums are subdivided into handy items and buried in the appropriations for other departments of Government. Ten thousand tomahawks for the Indian Bureau, at \$100 each? Don't bet it isn't spook money.

No other branch of Government enjoys the high-riding irresponsibility of CIA. The Atomic Energy Commission, which contains enough secrets to destroy earth, operates under a legislative watchdog committee that was established with the act that brought AEC into being. The Defense Department likewise lives under the scrutiny of House and Senate Armed Services Committees.

Thus it is not a sound argument to contend that a joint CIA committee would become a sieve of information that would peril secret projects. Even Allen Dulles, who departed as head of CIA soon after the catastrophe at the Bay of Pigs, conceded in his otherwise nonrevealing memoirs, "The Craft of Intelligence," that he knew of no betrayal or secret information by any Member of Congress.

Lately the Nation has witnessed the inevitable fruit of the weaknesses inherent in such a policy. Lee Kuan Yew, Prime Minister of Singapore, revealed the 5-year-old plot of a tawdry CIA comic opera in which the huge espionage apparatus was caught trying to penetrate the security department of Singapore. CIA promptly offered Prime Minister Lee (Western-educated, anti-communist, and a rare ray of sunshine in the morass of Asian politics) a \$3 million bribe to forget about it.

Mr. Lee proved incorruptible, which must have surprised the free-spending CIAers, and wrung a weasling letter of apology from Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Routine incompetence impelled State Department spokesmen to deny the episode when Mr. Lee revealed it, altho it was plain that the letter would eventually make maladroit liars out of them.

The big point here is not so much that the State Department rushed to show its traditional stupidity, nor even that the CIA has managed to convert Prime Minister Lee from a potentially valuable friend to an implacable—and scornfully contemptuous—enemy. The point is that dangerous dime-novel nonsense such as our all-thumbs man in Singapore perpetrated is inevitable as long as the CIA is permitted to go its headlong, unrestrained way.

The theory that Congress already exercises sufficient control over our spy agency simply won't float. Which of the clubby little group of appropriations committee spookwatchers authorized the \$3 million bribe, or even

knew about it? Was the two-headed author of the Singapore caper sacked, or is he comfortably tucked away in Stockholm clipping Red Star and planning new triumphs of clandestine diplomacy? This witness surely cannot answer those questions, and, more to the point, neither can the Congress.

The last time CIA found itself on the rack, Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat of Connecticut, read a speech (which the CIA had written) lamenting what was described as "CIA baiting." Sad to say, there will be occasion for much more of this baiting, until Congress takes the rule of law appropriate to an agency of Government in a democracy.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 9, 1965

TOLEDO, OHIO
TIMES

M. 31,571

MAR 11 1965

*File
St. Comm*

Watching The Watchers

EFFORTS to bring the Central Intelligence Agency under control of a joint committee of Congress are being renewed in the face of influential opposition from John McCone, who heads the espionage apparatus, and most of his top aids. There is, however, an articulate segment within the CIA which makes a convincing argument for some sort of congressional supervision.

The possibility of security leaks from such a committee, it argues, is remote. Nothing like that has ever happened in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and secret expenditures are routinely handled by the armed services committees. Nor is a joint committee on central intelligence likely to hamper the CIA in any legitimate undertaking. Congress routinely has allowed the FBI to go its own way, for example, and the CIA reasonably could expect the same treatment.

The chief advantage to the CIA would be in a congressional committee's ability to divert the fear and suspicion with which the agency is now held in many quarters here and abroad. Although an informal committee of senior House and Senate members is advised periodically of CIA activities as it is now, and overseas CIA appropriations which are hidden in other money bills, it has no legal existence. A permanent arrangement might command more public confidence.

As beneficial, superficially, as congressional cooperation might appear to the CIA, the efforts to achieve it are not likely to succeed in the near future. President Johnson, as a senator back in 1956, voted against the establishment of a joint CIA committee, and nothing of substance has occurred since to make him change his mind. Indeed, the natural inclination of a congressional committee to wash the CIA's considerable bundle of dirty linen in public, thus further eroding confidence in it, would tend to reinforce opposition to such supervision.